

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application with claims 1, 9, 15, 22 and 23 having been amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, 15, 17-20 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Svennesson et al.; and claims 2-4, 8, 13, 14, 16 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Svennesson et al. in view of Eaton et al.

Claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, 15, 17-20 and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Svennesson et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a method for providing a conference call supplemental service in an intelligent network, which includes setting a direct route between a Service Switch Point (SSP) and an intelligent peripheral (IP), and then announcing the conference call supplemental service to a subscriber using the direct route between the SSP and the IP without using the SCP to announce the service. Further, subscriber information is processed and collected. Independent claims 9, 15 and 22 include similar features in a varying scope.

Thus, as noted in the previously filed response, the IP performs the service announcement directly to the SSP, rather than the SCP performing the call announcement. As noted in the background of the related art, the conventional conference call service does not use a specific resource of the IP, and is provided in the form of only an accept conference request message and reject conference request message of a conference indicator between the SSP and the SCP (see page 3, paragraph [10]).

In response to these previous comments, the Office Action indicates the claims of the present invention do not specifically state that the IP is "directly" communicating with the SSP and that Svennesson et al. does teach that the IP and SSP are in communication with each other indirectly, because the SCP and the SSP communicate with each other and the IP and SCP are in communication with each other.

In light of this indication, independent claim 1 has been amended to state that the route between the SSP and IP is a direct route and the service is announced to a subscriber using the direct route between the SSP and the IP without using the SCP to announce the service. Independent claims 9, 15 and 22 indicate similar features in a varying scope.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1, 9, 15 and 22 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably define over Svennesson et al.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that the other rejection noted in the Office Action has also been overcome as the claims rejected therein are dependent claims and Eaton et al.

Serial No. 09/897,972
Reply to Office Action of September 22, 2004
Amdt. Dtd: December 20, 2004

Docket No. P-200

also do not teach or suggest the newly amended features or the combinations thereof.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection also be withdrawn.

Entry of the amended claims is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution without incorporating additional subject matter); (3) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; and/or (4) place the application in better form for appeal (if necessary). Entry is thus requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David A. Bilodeau**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. 09/897,972

Docket No. P-200

Reply to Office Action of September 22, 2004

Amdt. Dtd: December 20, 2004

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.
Registration No. 36,186
David A. Bilodeau, Esq.
Registration No. 42,325

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK/DAB:knv/cah:lew
Date: December 20, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610